

REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 8, 2008. Claims 1-7, 14-16, and 19-22 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 5, 14-16, 19, and 21 are in independent form. Claims 1-7, 14-16, and 19-22 have been amended to define aspects of Applicants' invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Initially, the Examiner is thanked for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview held on February 18, 2009, and for the Examiner's e-mail responding to Applicants' proposed set of claims. In the e-mail the Examiner agreed that the proposed claims overcome the *Yahoo!* reference but that upon a formal filing of the claims a further search and additional consideration are required. The claims presented herein are the same as those proposed to the Examiner. It is believed that this response represents a complete written statement as to the substance of the interview, in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-7, 14-16, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Archived Web Pages dated August 16, 2000 (*Yahoo!*), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,892,307 (*Wood et al.*). Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 5, 14-16, 19, and 21, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in the prior art of record that is believed to teach, suggest, or otherwise result in "causing a user interface to display input fields corresponding to the pre-selected method of authentication," and "causing the user interface to display a selection dialog box corresponding to the at least one alternative method of

authentication, wherein the input fields and the selection dialog box are presented on the same screen displayed on the user interface,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Applicants further submit that any combination of *Yahoo!* and *Wood et al.*, assuming such a combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest the above-mentioned features of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claims 5, 14-16, 19, and 21 include features similar to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and therefore are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants’ undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

*/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,551*

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2497407_1